

In the Drawings:

Please replace the original single drawing Figure with the enclosed Replacement Sheet, and add the enclosed New Sheet to the application. In the Replacement Sheet, the figure has been labeled as Fig. 1, and the "boxes" have been labeled in conformance with the specification. The New Sheet includes a new Fig. 2 schematically illustrating a flow diagram of an example of the inventive method originally described in connection with Fig. 1 in the specification at page 7 line 31 to page 10 line 6. Thus, the changes do not introduce any new matter.

[RESPONSE CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE]

REMARKS:

- 1) We have not yet received an acknowledgment of the first IDS of January 31, 2005. The Examiner is respectfully requested to consider the references of the first IDS of January 31, 2005 and return an initialed, signed and dated acknowledgment copy of the **IDS Form PTO-1449 of January 31, 2005**.
- 2) In accordance with the PCT procedures, the original specification of this application was a direct literal translation of the corresponding foreign language PCT International Application. The specification has now been editorially and formally amended to better meet US Application format (e.g. with added section headings), to clarify a few text passages, and to refer to Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 of the drawings being submitted in the Replacement Sheet and New Sheet enclosed with this Response. The specification amendments do not introduce any new matter. It is clear from the original disclosure that the "steering torque" refers to the actual torque value, while the "manual torque" refers to the desired torque value (for example see page 7 lines 24 to 30). It is also clear from the original disclosure that at least two axle models are provided and a suitable model is selected from among the plural provided models (for example see the original specification at page 6 lines 5 to 14, page 7 lines 5 to 9 and 21 to 24, and page 9 lines 24 to 31). Entry of the specification amendments is respectfully requested.

- 3) The claims have been amended as follows. In accordance with the PCT procedures, the original claims were based on a direct translation of corresponding foreign language PCT claims. The claims have now been amended editorially to streamline the language and better achieve typical US claim style and form in comparison to the directly translated PCT claims. Also, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate subject matter from prior claims 17 and 18 and clarifications supported by the above-cited portions of the original specification. Claims 18 and 23 have been canceled. Dependent claims have been amended for proper conformance with the amended independent claim wherever necessary. New claims 24 and 25 have been added. Claim 24 is an independent method claim based on subject matter from prior claims 1, 17 and 18 and further clarifications in view of the specification text portions cited above. Claim 25 is an independent apparatus claim reciting respective "means for performing" each of the steps of method claim 24. Thus, the claim amendments and the new claims do not introduce any new matter. Entry and consideration of the claim amendments and the new claims are respectfully requested.
- 4) The drawings have been amended by replacing the original single Figure with the enclosed Replacement Sheet, and adding the enclosed New Sheet, as discussed above in the drawing amendment section of this Response.
- 5) Referring to section 4 on page 2 of the Office Action, the objection to the drawings has been addressed in the present

drawing amendment. Fig. 1 has been clarified by adding text labels in conformance with the written description, and a new Fig. 2 has been added to schematically illustrate an example of the claimed inventive method. Therefore, the drawings now adequately illustrate the claimed invention. Accordingly, please withdraw the objection to the drawings.

- 6) Referring to section 5 on page 2 of the Office Action, the objection to claim 23 has been addressed as follows. Claim 23 has been canceled. New claim 25 is directed to an apparatus that is generally suited for carrying out the method according to claim 24. Namely, claim 25 is directed to an apparatus for determining a steering torque for a steering wheel of a motor vehicle with a continuous mechanical steering linkage between the steering wheel and steered wheels of the motor vehicle, and with a steering actuator effective on the mechanical steering linkage. Furthermore, the apparatus comprises respective "means for performing" each one of the method steps recited in claim 24. Thus, claim 25 now sets forth a clear and complete definition of the inventive apparatus. Please withdraw any objection in this regard.
- 7) Referring to section 6 on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the objection to claims 1 and 2 has been addressed in the present amendment.

The "axle model" has been clarified as "representing characteristics of an axle of the motor vehicle". Namely, the axle model is a model of characteristics of the axle of the motor

vehicle, and this model can be represented, for example, in computer hardware and/or software as a diagram, a table, a function, or a state observer. A plurality of axle models are provided. Then, among the available axle models, one axle model is selected depending on the actual existing driving situation, i.e. a model is selected that is favorable for the existing actual driving situation. This selected axle model is then used for determining the desired manual torque.

The previous recitation of "superimposing" the manual torque on the steering-wheel torque has been avoided. Rather, it has now been more clearly recited that a steering actuator is actuated responsive to any difference between the actual steering-wheel torque and the desired manual torque so as to adjust the steering-wheel torque toward the desired manual torque, as explained in the original specification, for example at page 9 line 32 to page 10 line 6, and as can be seen in original Fig. 1. Thus, the aim is that any deviation or difference between the actual torque value and the desired torque value shall be regulated-out by adapting or adjusting the actual torque value to the desired torque value.

Regarding claim 2, the phrase "is made easier" has been more clearly defined by reciting that the desired manual torque is determined such that turning of the steering wheel by the driver in a direction which is favorable in terms of the vehicle movement dynamics is made easier than according to the actual steering-wheel torque. Claim 14 has been similarly clarified to recite that turning of the steering wheel by the driver in a direction which is unfavorable for the vehicle movement dynamics

is made more difficult than according to the actual steering-wheel torque. Basically, the object to be achieved by the invention in this regard is that it shall become easier for the driver to turn the steering wheel in the "correct" direction while it becomes more difficult for the driver to turn the steering wheel in the "incorrect" direction. The "correct" direction of turning the steering wheel means the direction that would maintain or improve the driving stability of the vehicle, while the "incorrect" direction is the turning direction that would reduce the driving stability of the vehicle. This is explained in the original specification, for example at page 3 line 1 to page 4 line 9. In the claims, the comparative or relative basis of the phrase "made easier" is now defined and can be readily understood, without needing a further definition of "how easy it is" as proposed by the Examiner.

For the above reasons, please withdraw the objection to claims 1 and 2.

- 8) Referring to sections 7 and 8 on pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, in reply to the Species Election Requirement, applicant hereby elects Species I directed to a method of determining a steering torque for the steering wheel of a motor vehicle. After the present amendment, present claims 1, 2, 12, 14 to 17, 19 to 22 and 24 are directed to and read on the elected method invention of Species I. Prior apparatus claim 23 has been canceled. New apparatus claim 25 is directed to non-elected Species II, but it is properly linked to the elected method of claim 24. Namely, non-elected method claim 25 is directed to and

recites "means for performing" each of the method steps of elected method claim 24. Therefore, claim 25 is properly linked to claim 24, so that claim 25 must be examined together with the elected method claims (see MPEP 809 and 809.03). Thus, the Election Requirement is respectfully traversed in view of the present amendment, because non-elected claim 25 is now properly linked to elected claim 24. Please withdraw the Election Requirement and examine all claims.

- 9) Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application, including all present claims 1, 2, 12, 14 to 17, 19 to 22, 24 and 25, are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Werner BERNZEN et al.
Applicant

WFF:he/4836

Enclosures:

Transmittal Cover Sheet
Drawing Transmittal
1 Replacement Sheet
1 New Sheet
postcard

By Walter F. Fasse
Walter F. Fasse
Patent Attorney
Reg. No.: 36132
Tel. 207-862-4671
Fax. 207-862-4681
P. O. Box 726
Hampden, ME 04444-0726

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

I hereby certify that this correspondence with all indicated enclosures is being deposited with the U. S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as first-class mail, in an envelope addressed to: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.

Walter F. Fasse 1/16/08
Name: Walter F. Fasse - Date: January 16, 2008